

must all meet the problems here presented for solution, with a perfect frankness. The honour of anticipating the exigency and exposing the causelessness of alarm, before it was wide spread, regarding the march of science in this new region bordering on sacred ground, has been already won by great and good men, several of whom have gone to their rest.* But others, at what-

* A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* (No. clxxxii., Oct., 1849, Art. 1.) says: 'The recent interpretation of the commencement of Genesis—by which the first verse is simply supposed to affirm the original creation of all things, while the second immediately refers to the commencement of the human economy; passing by those prodigious cycles which geology demands, with a silence worthy of a *true* revelation, which does not pretend to gratify our curiosity as to the previous condition of our globe, any more than our curiosity as to the history of other worlds—was first suggested by geology, though suspected and indeed anticipated by some of the early Fathers.' The reviewer has not, in these sentences, expressed himself with his usual precision and accuracy. How could any interpretation be 'recent,' and 'first suggested by geology,' when it had been 'anticipated by some of the early Fathers?' My friend, Dr. Eadie, says, 'The length of time that may have elapsed between the events recorded in the first verse (of the first chapter of Genesis) and the condition of the globe, as described in the second verse, is absolutely indefinite. How long it was, we know not; and ample space is therefore given to all the requisitions of geology. The second verse describes the condition of our globe, when God began to fit it up for the abode of man. The first day's work does not begin till the